2.

SPEECHES

OF

Rev. Dr. WILSON and Rev. STUART ROBINSON,

AT THE

GREAT MEETING IN ST. LOUIS, JUNE 4, 1866.

[From the St. Louis Republican.]

Correspondence.

Rev. Drs. Stuart Robinson and S. R. Wilson, of Louisville, Ky.:

GENTLEMEN—Having seen with regret that you have been allowed no opportunity for explanation or defense in your General Assembly, the undersigned respectfully request you to deliver, if consistent with your feelings, addresses either upon the relation which Church and State bear to each other, or such other subjects as shall be most acceptable to yourselves. From the wide expressed desire to see and hear you, we suggest that this be done at the Mercantile Library Hall, on Monday evening next, at eight o'clock. Respectfully,

N. Paschall,	Rob't A. Barnes,
W. W. Green,	Jas. H. Lucas,
Henry Shaw,	Joseph Stettsmus,
Robert Aull,	John G. Priest,
Robert M. Renick,	Logan Hunton,
Henry Pilkerton,	R. McAnnally,
Henry B. Belt,	L. D. Baker,
S. Johnson,	O. D. Filley,
A. F. Shapleigh,	John How,
Jas. Stellinger,	Louis V. Bogy,
Wm. G. Clark,	F. B. Drever,
Wm. C. Taylor,	Thos. Russell,
W. Niehaus,	David H. Bishop,
B. R. Shore,	N. Newcomb, Jr.,
E. O. Sayb,	Levi Ashbrook,
John R. Triplet,	T. M. Barron,
L. F. White,	A. A. Ladd,
John J. Gill,	Ben. Blanchard,
B. H. Batte,	Sam'l N. Holliday,
F. Bull,	Basil Duke,
H. S. Brown,	J. Fogg,
E. F. Farish,	W. R. Carter,
R. M. V. Kercheval,	L. C. Alexander,
Thos. Lavaille,	R. J. Lockwood,
Robert Clark,	Wm. C. Scott,

And others.

ST LOUIS, June 2, 1866.

To Messrs. ROBERT A BARNES, J. H. LUCAS, N. PASCHALL, JOHN HOW, O. D. FILLEY and others:

GENTLEMEN—Accept my sincere thanks for the interest manifested in the great truths represented by Dr. Wilson and myself, as indicated in your desire to hear us on the relations of the Church to political affairs; and also, for the kind interest in desiring to afford us an opportunity for explanation.

Though it will, I feel, be a great tax upon the patience of the excellent people of my charge, who have a right to my services, to prolong my absence from my pulpit another Sabbath, still I cannot but feel that it is my duty to remain, and it will give me pleasure to address you, as you propose, at the Mercantile Library Hall, on Monday evening next, at 8 o'clock.

I take the liberty of answering also for my good friend Dr. Wilson, who is temporarily absent from the city—having had some conference with him on the subject of your note before he left—that he will also be present to address you.

Yours truly,
STUART ROBINSON.

An immense congregation of people gathered at Mercantile Library Hall last evening to listen to addresses from Rev. Dr. S. R. Wilson and Rev. Dr. Robinson. The hall at an early hour was filled to its utmost capacity, and many were compelled to go away, being unable to obtain even standing room. The meeting was held in compliance with the request of a large number of our most esteemed citizens, who, having seen during the progress of the General Assembly that these men—Drs. Wilson and Robinson—have been allowed no opportunity for explanation or defense, therefore a request was made that they would deliver, if consistent with their feelings, addresses upon the relation which Church and State bear to each other, or such other subjects as might be most acceptable to themselves.

At a little past 8 o'clock, Dr Robinson, Dr. Wilson, Dr. Brookes, Rev. Mr Bracken

and several other ministers ascended the platform and were greeted with great applause.

Rev. Dr. Brookes then came forward and said—in accordance with a request made by a number of gentlemen in our city, Rev. Dr. Wilson and Rev. Dr. Robinson will address you this evening, but I think it suitable that we should have our meeting opened with prayer. I therefore request Rev. Mr. Bracken to lead us in prayer to the throne of grace.

Mr. Bracken then opened the meeting with prayer, after which Dr. Brookes introduced Rev. S. R. Wilson, D. D. who spoke as follows:

SPEECH OF REV. S. R. WILSON.

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS: I may frankly say I regret the occasion that has called together this assemblage. It is one that may well fill the heart of every true patriot with sadness, and every friend of a free Christian Church with alarm. The recent transactions of that once venerable body, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, have been characterized by such a total disregard of the fundamental principles of Christian liberty; by such an utter recklessness of all the requirements of the constitution of the Church; by such a contempt for all the claims of Christian charity as enjoined in the word of God; in one word, by a spirit so wild, and revolutionary, and despotic, as to have aroused the indignation of the most moderate, and inspired even the timid and hesitating with courage and determination to play the man for justice and truth and the defense of the freedom which was purchased for the Church by the blood of the Prince of martyrs, and which has been transmitted to us by those who drank of the same cup of suffering and were baptized with the same bloody baptism.

Whilst, therefore, I cannot but regret that there should have been so loud a call for the utterance of this most emphatic protest against the injustice and wrong perpetrated by the Church I have loved more than life, my heart goes forth with gratitude and bounds with exultation as I see here exhibited a purpose to rebuke that tyranny which first condemns men unheard, and then proposes "to examine and decide." But it is not this alone nor chiefly that gives to this occasion a more than ordinary interest. It is not merely to maintain the supremacy of that law which forbids that any man shall be condemned and scourged without a hearing, and to show that no claim of sacredness can shield the most venerated court from merited rebuke when it suffers itself to be betrayed into the violation of right which belongs to the meanest criminal. There are other and even more important objects that have drawn together as by one consent this large assembly of intelligent and earnest Christian men and women. You have witnessed that conflict of logic and wit and satire which has been waged so fiercely for fifteen days between the ministers of the Gospel gathered from all parts of this vast continent and representing every section of this country. You have heard the most unmeasured denunciation of a certain paper known as the "Declaration and Testimony," and even the fiery thunder bolts of divine vengeance have been hurled at the hapless heads of those who have had the audacity to sign and publish that execrable document. And, as you have listened to these denunciations, I am sure the conviction must have forced itself upon your minds that certainly there must be something in that testimony fraught with more than ordinary good or ill to Church and country, or it never could have aroused in its enemies so great a frenzy of hatred, and nerved its friends to such self-sacrificing devotion. And it is under some such conviction and with the earnest desire to understand more fully and clearly what are the principles and aims urged upon the attention of the Christian world in this strangely abused and still more strangely adored "Declaration and Testimony" you are here to night. You have already perceived that at least on the part of that little band who have now been cast out of the Church of their fathers, this is no mere contention for personal preeminence; no struggle for party victory; no strife of words about matters of difference insignificant and unimportant. At all events, I cannot doubt that every one here is prepared to admit that we have been moved to the course which we have adopted in this contest by a sincere and profound conviction that it is a contest for the very vitals of a pure Christianity; that it is a struggle for the fundamental doctrines of the truth as it is in Jesus; that it is a conflict in which, if the now dominant power in the Church shall be victorious, then along farewell to the purity and freedom of the Church of God. Ichabod may be written upon her walls, for all her divine beauty and glory will have been exchanged for the meretricious adornments with which the god of this world has so often seduced the sons and daughters of Zion.

That it may be seen at a glance how well founded is the persuasion under which we, who have been ostracised, have been acting; that this is a contest in defense of the crown rights of Jesus and the independence of that kingdom which He won by His victory on the Cross, will be perfectly manifest if the point in controversy be attentively considered. These I shall briefly indicate, having upon a former occasion discussed and illustrated them at length. The doctrines which we maintain and which are set forth in this Testimony which I hold in my hand, and under which all the matter in dispute may be contained, are the following, viz:

I. That Jesus Christ is sole King and Head of the Church.

II. That He has established a Kingdom in the world which is called the Holy Catholic or Universal Church.

III. That to this Kingdom and as its King and by virtue of His kingly right, He has given a Constitution and laws, which none may add to or take away from, or in any

wise alter or annul. This Constitution and these laws are embodied in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

IV. That this Kingdom is diverse from all other kingdoms, in its origin, nature, means, ends and destiny—"Not reckoned among the nations," and a kingdom which is not of this world.

V. That this Kingdom is an independent sovereignty within its own sphere, and owes allegiance to none but its Head and King, Jesus of Nazareth.

VI. That this Kingdom, the Church, has to do with men solely in their spiritual relations to God in Christ as Redeemer.

VII. That there is another Kingdom, the State, which has to do solely with men as intelligent creatures and in their temporal relations one towards another. And this kingdom, the civil government, is sovereign and independent within its own proper sphere.

VIII The Kingly office of Christ cannot be impugned or subverted in any manner without undermining his Prophetic and tarnishing his Priestly offices.

IX. The highest act of apostacy that a Christian or Church can commit is to reject Christ as the King in Zion.

X. All union of the Church and State, whether by the subordination of the State to the Church or of the Church to the State, or of both combined, tends necessarily to the destruction of the freedom of both Church and State; and leads in the State to unmitigated despotism, and contains the germ of complete and final apostacy in the Church.

Now what we have affirmed is, that these doctrines have been either totally subverted or most seriously and dangerously impugned throughout our whole Church. By the acts and deliverances of the highest court, the General Assembly; by the acts and deliverances of subordinate judicatories, and those approved of by the General Assembly; by the semi-authoritative teachings of the professors of theology appointed by the General Assembly to train the ministry of the Church; by the approval of the conduct of those who have acted in utter contravention of these doctrines; by never having uttered one word in their vindication, even when earnestly petitioned to do so; by condemning and casting out of the Church those who have endeavored firmly and at all hazards, with such skill and wisdom as they could, to uphold and defend these cardinal truths. This is the indictment which has been laid at the door of the Church, not in anger but in sorrow, by the authors and signers of this Declaration and Testimony, upon which has been heaped so much reproach and obloquy. And it is in this we may find the reason of that persistent determination, by any means that could be made available, to exclude from the Church those who were thus troubling the consciences of those who had usurped the prerogative of the Divine Master. Surely, it can never be believed that it was on account of bad rhetoric or the undue multiplication of pungent adjectives, that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church found it necessary to resort to the unwonted measures it has been occupied in completing during the last three weeks? Judging from its exceeding tolerance, not to say evident enjoyment, of a discussion somewhat remarkable for the frequent disregard of the rules of logic and rhetoric, and a tolerably free use of not over mild adjectives, it could hardly be expected that we should believe that this venerable body of learned and pious divines should have been so entirely lost to every demand of propriety as to expel commissioners, cut off ministers and elders, and dissolve whole Presbyteries for the mere purpose of rendering odious a pamphlet of some twenty-five pages so devoid of sense and taste as to be made up of vituperative adjectives set as you were told by one of their most distinguished speakers, to be said, sung and danced to the horrid rebel tune of Dixie! Yet, though I do not believe the Assembly intended to be understood as committing any such folly as this, it does seem not a little strange that the whole stress in the arguments before that body was laid upon the language and style of the pamphlet, together with what some were pleased to call its spirit and intent. No one undertook to disprove its doctrines; no one undertook to refute its arguments; no one undertook to controvert its allegation of facts. The ablest committee for the purpose the body could furnish, selected with great care by the Moderator, who well understood what was the work to be done by that committee, after five or six days' labor, made an elaborate report upon the subject. And is there in that report one of the doctrines we have laid down cited as untrue? Is there on fact we have adduced shown to be false or perverted? Is there one passage of Scripture or of the Constitution of the Church to which we have appealed, that this able committee have proved to be misquoted, or misinterpreted, or misapplied? Not one. If they had allowed me fifteen minutes in the house, I would have undertaken to show that in that report the committee had both misquoted, misinterpreted, and misapplied nearly, if not quite all the score of extracts they made from our testimony. But even when doing this, they have not adduced one particle of proof in support of the charges made in the original paper of the committee, or in that finally adopted by the Assembly. No doubt the reason lies in the simple fact that there is in that declaration neither heresy, nor slander, nor rebellion, nor schism. No doubt its rhetoric is open to just criticism. But the men who uttered it were too much in earnest, and felt the evil they had to battle with to be too pressing to stand upon mere questions of rhetoric. It was the plain, unequivocal utterance of vital truth that they were aiming at. They wished to awaken a slumbering people. They wished to make themselves heard above the din and confusion of a furious civil strife. If in their

earnest and burning zeal for the safety of the Church they so fervently love; if in their anxiety to rescue the crown of their King from being trodden under the feet of the profane; if, whilst the multitude were vociferating for "loyalty" to Cæsar, they raised so loud a call upon the Church not to renounce her loyalty to Jesus as to startle the slumbering and terrify those whose treachery was surrendering the covenanted rights of Christ's kingdom and people, are they to be blamed for what they did? Surely, whatever may be the verdict of condemnation passed by men under the blinding influence of passion and prejudice, another generation will not only acquit but honor them as faithful witnesses for God, who, in an hour of fearful gloom, when "truth had fallen in the streets and equity could not enter," when the pillars of the Church trembled, and the foundations of justice and freedom were overturned, boldly stepped forth, at peril of all thing, to bear up the tottering pillars and stay the threatening ruin.

Dr. Brookes then introduced Dr. Robinson, who addressed the vast audience as follows:

(From the Louisville Courier.)

At the immense gathering in the great Mercantile Library Hall, St. Louis, on Monday evening, June 4, on the call of leading citizens of all religious persuasions, Rev. Stuart Robinson spoke as follows:

MEN AND BRETHREN: Giving thanks to God, our Father, who hath so ordered it in His providence, I next return thanks from my heart to you, most sincerely, for the kind interest in me and my views of the non-political character of the Church of God, evinced in your invitation and in this noble gathering this evening. I thank you, also, in the name of the noble body of ministers and private Christians whom I came to your city to represent. Nay, in the name of all the intelligent Christian people of every denomination throughout the land, who comprehend clearly enough the issues involved to understand the crisis to which both the Church and the State is brought by these issues, I express thanks for your kindness.

Recent ecclesiastical events are giving my friend Wilson and myself a prominence from which both of us would shrink if fidelity to truth permitted. It is Shakspeare, I think, who, by the mouth of one of his beautiful creations, declares, "Some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." We claim our greatness only under this third category—our opponents have thrust greatness upon us, even more than it is convenient to carry. If it were not a literary profanity to suggest an amendment to Shakspeare, I would make four classes rather than three; and to the classes of the born great—achieving greatness—having greatness thrust upon them, would add a still larger fourth class—of those *who thrust themselves upon greatness.* If Shakspeare lived in our age and country, I doubt not he would feel compelled to accept the amendment. For this thrusting themselves upon greatness and into places of power by men whom neither nature nor grace has fitted for it, is manifestly the peculiar curse of our time. And the present carnival of tenth-rateism we ought to regard as the scourge of God laid upon us for the follies and the sinful passions which made us deaf to the warnings of the God-made great men who used to lead us, in the palmy days of our Church and State, and who besought us often with tears to keep out of the quarrels that led to the recent fratricidal war

I set up no claim personally to the distinction given me here to-night. I am one unknown to fame. As Henry Ward Beecher said contemptuously of Dr. Thornwell, my name is not found in the "Men of the Times." Since I declined the offer, ten years ago, of one John Livingston, biographical dictionary maker, and immortality-broker, who offered me a vacant lot under his vast *squatter title* in the territory of the immortals for $10, with the book thrown in. I have given up all hopes of that sort. I might have liked the immortality well enough, but could not stand the book. I take it, therefore, that this honor to-night is an offering to the great principles of which circumstances have made me one of the representatives. These principles have been concisely set before you by Dr. Wilson, and my general aim will be to show that these principleiples are worthy of all acceptation.

You are aware, men and brethren, that ever since the conflict between truth and falsehood began in the world, the grand strategy of the Devil, the god of falsehood, has been, whenever he found the argument of the witnesses for the truth at all troublesome, then to evade its force by destroying, if possible, the *character* of witnesses So you will recall the case of Elijah (1 Kings, ch. 18), who was cursed and abused as "he that troubleth Israel," because he testified that Jehovah was the true King, and Ahab, as Dr. Hodge would say, "a usurper of the prerogatives of Jehovah" So you may remember the case of Micaiah (1 Kings, ch. 22), who, when ordered by the Government to concur with the lying prophets, and "go in for the war" against Syria, declared he would not prophesy according to the order of his Government, but only say what Jehovah, his King, told him to say. And he was handed over as a traitor and a felon to Provost Marshal-General Amon, in order to destroy his influence over the people, with the order "Put this fellow—dirty dog—into prison, and feed him with the bread of affliction and the water of affliction." So, again, when Jeremiah insisted on proclaiming the orders of Jehovah, the true King, against the schemes of a caucus of leaders that set themselves alike against Zedekiah, the vicegerent, and Jehovah himself (Jer. 37th, and 38th), they branded him as a

Chaldean spy, and imprisoned him in a loathsome dungeon, because he would not accept their interpretations of Providence instead of the express words of Jeovah.

It is a very curious fact in sacred history, that, of all the issues between truth and falsehood, that concerning the kingly power of Christ as lawgiver in his Church always seemed to arouse usurping kings and factions to the most malignant efforts against the character of those who testified to it. When the great King in Zion came himself incarnate, and the common people heard him gladly, and hailed him as King with hosannas, usurping ecclesiastics even of his divinely organized Church assailed him with abuse, as a companion of publicans and sinners. And, when nothing else would do to secure his death, charged him with treason to that Cæsar whom they in their hearts cursed. Trying him at the bar of their General Assembly and finding themselves hard run for a pretext for pronouncing the sentence which, as dictated by a preliminary caucus, was a foregone conclusion, their leader, Caiaphas, adroitly leaped over all barriers of logic and law, by flying into a phrenzy of holy passion—shouting, "blasphemy! blasphemy!" and rending his sacred robes of office, and so calling at once the previous question, and voting the sentence, condemned him to death as a malefactor! So they cleared all the barriers of law and logic before the secular court by inciting the soldiers and the mob to mock him as an imposter, and, by an adroit phrenzy of loyalty, shouting, "No King but Cæsar," secured his execution as a low imposter. And when that amiable man Nicodemus, in the same body—that "middle man" Nicodemus—that man whose conscience was one way, and whom policy pulled so strongly the other, ventured to speak out and say, when they were denouncing him, "Doth our law condemn a man before he is heard?" (it does a great many in our time.) What is the answer to this? "Well now, search and look, Doth a prophet ever come out of Gallilee?"—one of their wise saws and modern instances.

So the grand strategy of the enemy, when the great argument of his Apostles in favor of Jesus as "a *Prince* and a Savior" could not be answered. The charges that they were "pestilent fellows"—those men that disturb the peace of the Church—"that turn the world upside down," &c., were the arts whereby the character of his witnesses should be destroyed in order to check their influence over the people. The self-ease of men makes the cry "disturbers of the Church," those who 'turn the world up-side-down," very effective. When Satan, taking some opportunity while the world is asleep, or excited by revolution, to get the world turned wrong-side up, he is, of course, then ready to have quiet, and therefore will incite men against all effort to turn it up-side-down again. That is, back to the position Christ would have it. So I might go on and illustrate the case from every period of church history.

It would therefore have been an exceptional case, rather than according to the general rule, had such a crisis, brought on the practical conflict between the true doctrine of the non-political character of the Church, "the kingdom not of this world," and its antagonist doctrine of some sort of function of the Church to take part in Cæsar's strifes and divisions, if we who stand for the truth against the storm of popular passion without, and the ravings of fanaticism within the Church, had not been vilified and abused. You will pardon me, therefore, if I seem to speak too much of myself in connection with so great a theme in which self should be forgotten, when I remind you that in my case the strategy of destroying the character of the witness, whose testimony cannot be gainsayed, has been very thoroughly tried.

In the first place, the Christian world has been taught by every form of insinuation, that my doctrine of the non-political character of the Church was all an after thought, and a pretense to hide my sympathy and concurrence with the rebellion. How absurd and calumnious that charge is, I happen to have very conclusive evidence to show. These are the facts: That I began my public teaching and witness on this subject in Baltimore in 1854—six years before the war.

In January, 1856, in the "Presbyterial Critic," in review of a sermon on National Character, by my friend, Mr. Burt, and with special reference to the statement of Dr. Hodge, "that it would be the duty of the State to secure the preaching of the Gospel to the people, were the State not anticipated by other agencies," I asserted the following propositions: See Critic, vol. 2, page 39:

"We venture, however, without attempting to present even a synopsis of the reasoning by which we would defend them, to enunciate several propositions affirming the contrary of most of the propositions contained in the foregoing citations, for the serious consideration of all who take an interest in the subject of the relation of the State to religion in our country. We affirm, then:

1 That it is not true as an abstract proposition that "The preservation of Christianity is one of the main ends of government." Nor that the promotion of religion is primarily among the objects for which the State is established. But that, primarily, the ends of government are simply the protection of the persons and property of men, irrespective of any religious opinions they may entertain. And, therefore, any relation is merely incidental, and any respect which the State as such pays to any religious opinions, is not because they are *true* in the judgment of the Government, but simply because the people creating the State *hold such opinions.*

2. That the State has no such *moral personality*, nor "is itself a moral person responsible to God" in any such sense as infers any obligation devolving on the State, as such, to promote the true religion. Nor can any moral personality be predicated of the State which is not equally predicable of any other association of men under solemn

covenant—as a bank or a railroad corporation. For though there be in an important sense a judgment (temporal) appointed for national wrong-doing, yet not States as States, but men as men, are to stand at the judgment bar of God, and every one of *us* shall give account of *himself* before God.

3. That, therefore, in no direct and proper sense, can the "State have a character directly religious;" nor in any other sense religious than a railroad corporation must be religious. That government is of Divine appointment no more infers that government is a religious thing, than the fact that Cyrus was constituted a government by Divine appointment infers that Cyrus was religious.

4. That the ground on which our laws recognize the Sabbath as a day of rest, and prohibit blasphemy, appoint oaths, &c., is not because the State as a religious "moral person," determines the Sabbath to be of Divine authority, or that blasphemy is a sin against God, or that God will punish men who swear falsely, but simply that the people who have created the government believe the Sabbath to be of Divine appointment and necessary, and that the people are aggrieved in their religious feelings by blasphemy, &c.

5. That it is not one of the functions of the State, as such, to teach religion, or to send out missionaries, or to ordain, or cause to be ordained, Chaplains for its Legislature, and army and navy. Nor does the use of Chaplains involve any determination, by authority, of the question of religion. But Chaplains are simply recognized thereby as among the proper personal necessities of the members of the Legislature, or of the men in the service of the Government—just as stationery and fuel and rations are personal necessities to be provided for. And but for the peculiar position of men in the army and navy, which renders a choice and a "call" of a minister impossible, the Government ought not to assume the prerogative of appointing them."

Now, men and brethren, at the meeting of the General Assembly the following spring, with these views thus published, that body selected their author for the responsible work of teaching the doctrine of the Church in the Danville Seminary, which selection should certainly not have been made if his views on so important a subject as the relation to Church and State in America had then been held unsound.

In an inaugural address at the meeting of the Assembly in Lexington, Ky., and subsequently in a small volume on the "Church of God," while Professor at Danville, I again published (see Robinson's "Church of God," p. 85) the following propositions touching the relation of the temporal to the spiritual order:

"Touching the distinction between the power ecclesiastical and the civil power—which latter is ordained by God also—the points of contrast are so fundamental that nothing but the confusion of mind arising from the oppression of Cæsar, and Antichrist backed by the power of Cæsar, could ever have caused the obscurity and inconsistency of the Church's testimony in modern times. For they have nothing in common except that both powers are of Divine authority, both concern the race of mankind, and both were instituted for the glory of God as a final end. In respect to all else—their origin, nature and immediate end, and in their mode of exercising the power—they differ fundamentally. Thus they differ:

1. In that the civil power derives its authority from God as the author of nature, whilst the power ecclesiastical comes alone from Jesus as Mediator.

2. In that the rule for the guidance of the civil power in its exercise is the light of nature and reason, the law which the author of nature reveals through reason to man; but the rule for the guidance of ecclesiastical power in its exercise is that light which, as Prophet of the Church, Jesus Christ has revealed in his word. It is a government under statute laws already enacted by the king.

3. They differ in that the scope and aim of the civil power are limited properly to things seen and temporal; the scope and aim of ecclesiastical power are things unseen and spiritual. *Religious* is a term not predicable of the acts of the State; *political* is a term not predicable of the acts of the Church. The things pertaining to the kingdom of Christ are things concerning which Cæsar can have rightfully no cognizance, except indirectly and incidentally as these things palpably affect the temporal and civil concerns of men; and even then Cæsar cannot be too jealously watched by the Church. The things pertaining to the kingdom of Cæsar are matters of which the Church of Christ as an organic government can have no cognizance, except incidentally and remotely as affecting the spiritual interests of men; and even then the Church can not watch herself too jealously."

You see, men and brethren, I stand now precisely where I have stood for at least seven years past; and therefore any insinuation that I refused to preach or pray politics, because of political sympathies merely, or that I edited a paper devoted to the exposition and defense of such views merely from political bias against any party in the State, or that from considerations of expediency and policy merely I occupied the platform of no mixture of politics and religion, is utterly unkind and unchristian, so far as it refers to my course.

If I needed any other proof of the silly falsehood that my views of the Church were gotten up as a refuge in the war, I need only cite the well known fact that though I was there only during two years of the ten years active existence of the school, three-fourths of all the students who come forth from that school hold my views of the nature and relations of the Church to the State, against the views which for five years past have issued from Danville. Now, this proves either that I must have exercised a very extraordinary influence over the school, and my colleagues a very feeble one, or else they must have taught them the same theory which I taught, and our present antagonism must grow out of the fact that

they gave way before the clamor of "no King but Cæsar," and shaped their teachings to their political prejudices. I think it is they who have departed from the platform, where we used to stand together; and if there is any change by reason of political principles, I am not the man who made it. I hold the same views here to-night that I did ten or eleven years ago.

If I have dwelt long on this point, I have, in illustrating it, incidentally brought before you the great germinal truths upon which this whole controversy turns, and in briefer form than could be done in an extempore statement.

I claim that this showing in the case ought to give its quietus to the miserable fabrication, either that my views of Church and State were shaped to suit my prejudices in the late contest, or that I have taught anything but what my church has in better days fully indorsed.

There is an equally short answer to the pretense, in the second place, that I am unworthy of trust as a public teacher of religion in this regard, because I have not in practice carried out my theory, but have myself played the political partisan as a minister, till compelled to leave the country, and then played the partisan and conspirator abroad.

For here again my record happens to be a somewhat public one. The charge was met at the time by an appeal to public and notorious facts, and, so far as known to me, the statement never was challenged. In the first place the charge as now made involves a not very slight anachronism in the matter of my leaving the country. I did not leave either at or near the the outbreak of the war as one too "disloyal" to risk it. For the first year and a half of the war I continued actively employed as a pastor in Louisville, one of the *foci* of the public excitement, and, therefore, gave ample opportunity for comparing my conduct as a minister with my principles of a non-political ministry. Not only so, but when, in order to destroy my influence, this charge of inconsistency and disloyalty was publicly made—then and there, when any misstatement could be exposed, I made an "Appeal to the Christian public" against the calumnies of an article in the Danville Review, in which I set forth fully my position as follows:

"I fearlessly appeal to all men of all parties, public officers and private citizens, who of their own knowledge have known my manner of life for eighteen months past, for the correctness of the following general statement:

"First, That as a citizen I have waived my rights, and abstained from all writing and public discourse on political subjects. That I have neither made any parade of, nor any concealment of, my political opinions, which opinions have been those of probably nine-tenths of the people of Kentucky up to six months ago, if not now, viz: *For* the Union on the basis of the Crittenden Compromise, or proper guarantees to the slave States; *against* the theory of secession, and *against* the Black Republican platform. That with such political opinions, my prejudices have also been the natural prejudices of a Border State man against Abolitionism, only heightened, perhaps, by religious convictions of the atheistic tendencies of that fanaticism. That with such political opinions and such prejudices my feelings have been only those natural to a man reared in Virginia, and bound to her people by a thousand obligations for unbounded kindness and almost parental affection toward me from the days of my childhood and poverty, on through youth and manhood up to the time of this unhappy war. That yet, quietly acquiescing in the decision of the people of Kentucky at the last election, however I might doubt its wisdom, I have honestly and faithfully, as a citizen, abided by, respected and obeyed the laws as administered in the State, and that, according to the Apostolic injunction, "not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake;" that not only conforming to the rigid demands of law as a citizen, but also as a Christian man, I have allowed no prejudice to limit my obligations. For, while I have steadfastly repelled the blasphemous claim of either monarch or mob to assume the functions of Omniscience, and search into the secret sympathies of the heart, for the test of true allegiance to Cæsar, I have, on the other hand, never failed to express my honest sympathy with the sick, the wounded, the suffering and often neglected Federal soldiers, and to attest that sympathy in most substantial form, to the whole, and more than the whole, extent of my ability, as thousands of the soldiers and scores of their officers will testify, and have testified, with tears of gratitude."

Men and brethren,, if there was anything in the whole of that great rebellion that stirred my soul with indignation always within me, it was not the robberies that I had to endure; it was this claim set up by coarse, vulgar men, to come and pry into the sympathies of my heart, demanding— [The remainder of the sentence was lost amid applause and cheers.] It is blasphemy against God for man to aspire to legislate for the soul, which rises above their bolts and bars, independent of them, as Gabriel upon the walls of Heaven. It is blasphemy. I so pronounce it and always did pronounce it, and it is none of their business where my sympathies are. [Tremendous cheering.] Thomas Jefferson says in that great act establishing religious freedom: "it is time enough for the Government to interfere when feelings and opinions break out into overt acts." A man cannot be condemned because he has these natural sympathies of gratitude with which God Almighty has endowed our nature, and which stick to us amid all the depravity which has fallen upon our nature. Tell me I must not have sympathy with the people who, when I was a poor Irishman's son, took me by the hand and helped me to help myself—that best way of helping—that people in old Berkley, Va.! And when I went over to the other side of the ridge, to

the Seminary at old Prince Edward—shall I ever forget it, brethren? I was about, after a year's study, to leave that school of the prophets because my money had given out, and to go out teaching again, as I had been doing before, to get money to go on, when some noble spirit, I know not who, with a delicacy that belongs nowhere in such a degree as to the men of that glorious straight-forward, old-fashioned plantation State. [Cheering.] As I had got all ready, and was packing up my baggage to leave, old Doctor Baxter took me to his study, and says he "I have a note here from a friend which I will read to you." "Some of the boys," he read, "have told me that young Robinson is to leave the Seminary to go and get some more money. We cannot spare young men like him, and I send him $100, which I wish him to make use of, and when he gets ready to pay it back." No name. When I went back afterward, when God had prospered me, to hunt up that old man and pay back that $100, I was unable to find him, and never have been from that day to this. He was one of those who did not let his left hand know what his right hand doeth. I to be condemned as a traitor because I have sympathy with the people that treated me thus in my boyhood! [Loud applause.]

Now, this declaration was not only made in the face of the whole community which knew my manner of life, but was brought to the attention of the General Assembly of 1862, of which I was a member. No one even challenged it. And notoriously I retained the confidence of the military officers, in spite of all the efforts of ecclesiastical malignity, up to the time of my leaving home. Even so late as January, 1863, I received the following remarkable testimony to my fidelity to principle, from one of the most trusted and trustworthy of the military directors of the State, into whose hands the power was put after it was taken from Governor Magoffin. It is a statement which, as I had occasion to publicly remind the President, is equally creditable to me and discreditable to the administration under which it was made. Says a letter to me from this high official:

"I have felt that yours is a peculiarly hard case, *for I never heard even your bitterest accusers allege one act of yours which deserved condemnation;* and yet I feel sure that you are acting wisely in remaining a fugitive from your family, your congregation and your business."

It would seem to me that these references should give a quietus to the multitude of falsehoods expressed and insinuated that my practice contradicted my doctrine of the non-political character of the ministry.

At the first outbreak of the politico-ecclesiastical fanaticism, seeing that not a single Protestant religious journal was open for the utterance of our doctrine, I established an organ called the True Presbyterian in April, 1862, at Louisville, devoted exclusively to the exposition and defense of the principle of a non-political Church. This, no doubt, was the grand secret of the defamatory assaults begun upon me, and ever since kept up by the Protestant journals of the whole country. Though not a line of political, or military, or secular news or discussion was admitted into its columns, yet being a terrible thorn in the flesh to all those who were seducing the Protestant Churches into the political apostacy, when all liberty of speech was destroyed in Kentucky, after the election of 1864, the paper was suppressed by military authority. An extract from the protest and appeal to the public at that time will here show that the suppression of my paper was not because my practice contradicted my doctrine. I then wrote:

"As to 'sympathy with rebellion,' that modest and convenient official synonym for non-sympathy with the party in power, which is insinuated as the reason for this suppression, suffice it to say that it would answer equally well as a reason to justify the arrest and suppression of the business of every one of the 1,700,000 voters, and of the 10,000,000 population they represent, who at the recent election expressed their want of sympathy with the administration. Nay, would more clearly justify it, since these millions positively and actively opposed the administration, while the True Presbyterian, confining itself exclusively to ecclesiastical matters, stood aloof from all political and military questions, except in directly, as they were obtruded upon the Church.

"The readers of the True Presbyterian need not to be told that, neither recently nor at any time, has the paper contained a single paragraph justly obnoxious to any law, civil or military; that it never published or commented upon political or military news; and that it confined itself exclusively to Church affairs, especially to expounding the duty of the Church to stand aloof from secular questions, after the example of Christ and his Apostles.

"Indeed, if the current estimate of Gen. Burbridge in Kentucky is to be taken, it would be gross injustice to suspect him of ever having read a column of the paper, or of the capacity to understand it if he had. Manifestly, therefore, something else than the contents of the paper must have been the reason for suppression; for it is not to be presumed that the Government has got to the point of punishing, as a crime, even bold and outspoken opposition to the use of the Church and her agencies for the support of political measures and principles, or bold and outspoken rebuke of obsequious ecclesiastics, even though they be friends of the Government. So far, Mr. Lincoln, on the contrary, has declared against Governments 'running the churches.' The real cause not being within his own knowledge, the editor is inclined to accept the explanation given by popular opinion in the State, which traces the suppression of the True Presbyterian to the same source as the arrests of Col. Jacobs and Mr. Shipman, the former of whom wrote, and the latter published and editorially indorsed, a scathing exposure of the reckless mendacity of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge in the Danville Review."

This paper had been violently opposed

from the first. I was determined if it cost the last dollar I had—and it did take all I had—that I would have a hearing, and taking all I had, I put it in that organ and kept talking, and I said all I had to say in the true vernacular, and if that is treason make the most of it. [Applause.] That paper went on. It was growled about and was an evesore, although I never allowed a word of political or military news to go into it. But yet that paper was specially disloyal in the eyes of a certain class of men; and one Sunday day night, in going to my congregation, when there was great excitement in the city and general alarm, an officer thought he ought to do something to save the State. He was a Presbyterian, and it was Sunday, and so he sent down a policeman, who laid hold of me before my congregation, so as to create a panic, I suppose. What was the next step? I was taken over to the Provost Marshal's office, and in a room an interesting billetdoux from the General commanding was read to me, giving notice that my paper could not come out on Thursday morning. All these days between, and yet he has to step in on Sunday night and stop me on my way to my pulpit to hear the order.

As to the charge that, because of conscious disloyalty, I fled from home and went and conspired and preached against my Government in Canada, it is sufficient merely to say, of a matter known to so many persons, and therefore easily disproved if untrue, that I left home on a vacation tour in July, 1862, which I had arranged for while at the Assembly of 1862, in May—never having been arrested or called upon to take any military oath; that I was, in August, traveling in Canada, expecting to go by way of Montreal to Boston, when I met numbers of our best citizens, who had fled from a reign of terror inaugurated in Louisville, which, without cause shown, was arresting, imprisoning and banishing the best men of the city; that, by the advice of friends and the concurrence of my pastoral charge, I quietly remained in Canada to await the return of law and order; for, as the irresponsible power of this reign of terror was in the hands of the very men whom I had before exasperated by certain ecclesiastical controversies—first with the Unitarian minister, Mr. Attorney Gen'l Speed's brother-in-law; secondly, with certain self-constituted representatives of what we popularly call Campbellism; and, thirdly, with the venerable Professor of Theology at Danville, nobody supposed they would permit me to go on with my work as a pastor and public teacher in Kentucky. I, therefore, remained where I was. Finding a noble university and other excellent schools of every grade in Toronto, I superintended the education of my own children there, and also directed and advised, as far as I could, the education of the scores of youths who were driven thither from all parts of the United States. Being a minister of religion well known, I acted as adviser and protector of many ladies with their families, whom the troubles and outrages of the times drove thither. Not being disposed to affiliate with my Presbyterian brethren there, or they with me, on account of their thinking me a great sinner according to the anti-slavery gospel, and I thinking them semi-infidels according to my doctrine of the authority of the Scriptures, as the inspiration of God, I procured a public hall and preached regularly for near three years for the benefit of the students and other transient people of the city, refusing any compensation. In the meantime I wrote diligently for my paper while it was published, and latterly wrote a large volume expository of the scheme of redemption as revealed in the Scripture. Whether thus occupied in watching over the young—aiding and comforting helpless women and children—preaching the Gospel to crowds of people, embracing some five hundred educated young men—editing my religious journal, and writing expositions of the Gospel—I was discharging the functions of my office in accordance with my principles, as well as if I had been getting up bogus stock schemes and swindling emigration schemes, or in firing the Northern heart to the extermination point, or playing patriotic hanger-on to invading armies, perpetrating pious stealings and robberies among a helpless people, or in playing the ecclesiastical loafer at large—all that I must leave to the decision of the grave doctors who think my election to their body an insult and defiance.

That I have stated correctly my occupation in Canada—that I kept aloof from any and all acts of hostility against my Government, and in no case practised in Canada differently from my doctrine, as to the functions of a Gospel minister—is simply one of those notorious public facts that can be attested by thousands of people. Men and women of the highest character in half a score of States of the Union can attest it. Men here in this assembly to-night, no doubt, who know my manner of life in Canada, will attest it. I offer, as a specimen of what five hundred men will say, the following note from one of the most intensely Northern men I met in Canada, which was published in connection with what I took occasion to say myself in a public letter of June 19, 1865, in response to the infamous insinuation of one of Mr. Joseph Holt's utterances through the lips of one whom at the time he could not but know was a poor perjured wretch:

"So much for the refugee in Canada. Now as to the intensity of my treason here I happen to have the means at hand, Mr. Emmons, of demonstrating that, during my voluntary exile in Canada, I have faithfully maintained my integrity as a citizen of the United States, and as the minister of a non-secular gospel. With little personal acquaintance, indeed, the American Consul here, as fierce as the fiercest for the Administration, yet a just man, will no doubt declare to you, as he has voluntarily declared to me, that, though in a position, as the great ear-trumpet of the Government here, to hear everything, he has never before

heard my name associated with any violent speech or hostile action against the United States Government. The large congregation that attended upon my ministry, especially every Sabbath evening, composed in large part of those who sympathise with the North, and a still larger part of those who are utterly out of sympathy with my opinions touching the Bible and slavery, not long since presented me with a strong testimony to my faithfulness, candor and moderation as a minister; and, appended to this testimonial, is the following very clear declaration, touching the "intensity" of my treason, from a man whose own sympathies have been "intensely" with the North, and whose business is of a character which makes him, next to the American Consul, best acquainted with every man's reputation in Canada:

"'Rev. Stuart Robinson—Dear Sir: I have heard of the testimonial presented by your present hearers in Toronto, and as one who for two years enjoyed the rare privilege of personal and pastoral relationship with you in Toronto, I desire to add my testimony to your fidelity as a minister of the Gospel, to your principles of non-interference of the Church of God with the secular affairs of the day, or of the State with the Church of God.

"'Let me say that, though differing from you strongly on the subject of slavery, and in many respects as to your views of the struggle in the United States, I never had my feelings hurt, or prejudices offended, in all I ever heard you say. On the contrary, I always admired your reticence in respect to the cause and course of the war, and seldom heard a reference to it except a prayer for a righteous peace.'

"Now, Mr. Emmons, this is the testimony of 'intense' Northern men concerning the man whom Mr. Joseph Holt gets a perjured villain to swear and publish to the world 'is one of the most intense of the traitors who have taken refuge in Canada.' This is the man whom ecclesiastical cut-throats, even of his own Church, are hounding on you, perhaps, as well as the secular press, to vilify as not only a traitor, but a felon and a plotter of crimes against humanity!"

This letter to Emmons, remember, was written and published in Canada—with the people to whom I appealed around me and the American Consul on the spot—any of them to answer and dispute if they dared to challenge.

I may safely leave here this question of my occupation in Canada, referring you to the hundreds of Americans who knew me there. Ask any of them if they ever knew me to have any other connection, with even Southern friends there, than in measures of common Christian charity, such as every Gospel minister is bound to do, and such social intercourse as gentlemen should have with each other. Ask any Canadian, of them all, (outside, of course, the clique of the Toronto Globe, whose anti-slavery fanaticism led it to assail me when I first went there,) if ever, as a minister, I varied from the practice of my theory of a non-political ministry.

But at the close of the war those who had been asserting and defaming me as the witness for this doctrine seemed to grow desperate at the thought of my return home to renew the conflict on more equal terms, they having no longer the bayonet argument with which to silence me. And as a last desperate expedient they conspired seemingly with certain functionaries of the Government to take advantage of the popular insanity about plots, conspiracies and assassinations to associate my name in the popular mind with these horrible affairs. They were cautious enough, indeed, not to risk their credibility even before a public mad with its craving to be fed with the most highly-seasoned sensational horrors, by charging more than merely some knowledge of the existence of these plots on my part. Suddenly liars and perjurers were at a premium, Government agents were out in search of them, and they became the heroes of the hour. Under this state of things no wonder that creatures could be found ready enough to swear anything which the men that controlled the money wanted. The result was the famous "suppressed testimony" in the Bureau of Military Justice—suppressed, the gullible public were told, from some mysterious danger to the lives of the witnesses, but suppressed, as the event shows, from a mysterious danger rather to the life of their lies before they had finished the work, and danger to the political and social life of their employers, if those calumniated by them should get an opportunity of exposing them. As a matter of literary curiosity I have looked over the witchcraft trials and treason trials of the dark and bloody times in England, to compare with these proceedings in the Bureau of Military Justice, and I hesitate not to give the judgment, that gullibility more voracious on the part of the recipients of the testimony, lawlessness more outrageous on the part of those who gathered and drew out the testimony, perjuries more barefaced, villainous and preposterous than the whole of the testimony itself, cannot be found in all history than what is known as the "suppressed testimony." I cannot here go into that question, but must refer you to my letter to Mr. Emmons, of the 19th of June last; and still more particularly to the protest of W. W. Cleary against the President's proclamation, appended to which will be found the suppressed testimony examined, and the evidence, carefully taken in due form of law, establishing beyond the possibility of question that every one of the three witnesses—Montgomery, Merrit, and Conover—not only perjured themselves in every statement, but that their perjuries are of the most preposterous character, and impossible to be true; that not a man of a score or more named by them could possibly have been at Montreal to be seen and spoken to by them as they represent; that Merrit himself was not within five hundred miles of Montreal during the month that he pretended to have been present at con-

spiracies there and to have heard a letter read from Jefferson Davis, etc.; that Montgomery, who claimed to be Thompson's messenger, never was in Jacob Thompson's service at all, being detected as an imposter the first time he ever met him; that Conover, who swore to all the interviews and plots with Thompson in Montreal, during the memorable January and February, 1865, never saw Thompson, who was not within three hundred miles of Montreal during the time, nor, as Conover's own letter shows, had he any acquaintance with Thompson up to March 20th, '65, when Conover wrote proposing himself to destroy the Croton Waterworks, and was denounced by Thompson as a fool. Mr. Cullen, book-seller across the street here, tells me he has arranged to get within a few days a supply of this remarkable pamphlet of Mr. Cleary. To that I refer any of you who wish to look into this curious matter.

It was the last named of these witnesses (Conover), and the absurdest liar of them all, through whom Mr. Holt sought—as I verily believe, by ecclesiastical instigation—to taint my reputation as a minister, by asking if he had not seen me associating with the so-called conspirators at Montreal, and got the facile perjurer to answer yes, though I never have been in Montreal since, in June, 1864, I attended a wedding there, as once before I went there to see poor James B. Clay die, and once before passed Montreal on a visit to Quebec. And yet this bare faced liar swore to seeing me in Montreal in January, to March, 1865, associating with Thompson and Blackburn and assenting to schemes of murder, though a thousand people knew I could not have been in Montreal after June, 1864, about the time the Confederate Commissioners were on their way to Upper Canada.

This lie was the more disgraceful to Mr. Holt from having been suggested by his question to a perjurer whom Mr. Holt must have known to have just perjured himself in swearing directly the reverse of what he had sworn only three months before in the trial of the St. Albans raiders. A perjurer who within a week or two swore he had never been to Washington to swear at all! That some imposter personated him! And then went back to Washington and swore that he swore this in peril of his life, from a crowd of desperadoes headed by one of the most prominent lawyers in Montreal! Such was the creature whom Mr Holt used to taint the good name of a gospel minister!

The other tool employed to get this stain fixed on my character was a miserable Jew-Christian Atheist, whom Mr. Emmons knew, as he admitted to myself and Gov. Magoffin, before the creature was shipped to the "Bureau of Military Justice," to be a wretch who kept his oath for sale, and boasted that for five dollars he would swear anything to suit—who had sworn a Kentuckian out of Fort Lafayette as a British subject, in spite of the precautions of Lord Lyons and Lord Monck to guard against his perjuries—and who, of course, for the $150 which Mr Emmons gave him as a retainer, would swear thirty lies as great. This miserable creature—whom a stranger had written me, as a minister of the Gospel, to assist in his wretched poverty to the amount of $20 and draw on him for the money, and concerning whose character I happened to inquire of Dr. Blackburn, also then a stranger to me personally, with whom I never spoke twenty minutes—took advantage of the premiums offered for perjurers to turn a penny, and finding that something toward defaming me would be an acceptable article in the market, took advantage of that accidental meeting with Dr. Blackburn to weave me in as one of the heroes of his filthy and devilish yellow fever romance; not indeed as an actor in the drama—that would endanger the credibility of his story—but as a sort of outside adviser. But when this poor creature was called back to Toronto to testify in the case before a real court of justice, like his ancestor and patron saint, Judas, conscience-stricken at the villainous use he saw was made of the lie against the man whose charities had kept his wife and children from starvation, he handed to the American Consul his solemn recantation of the lie, to be given to me. Here it is, with the Consul's indorsement.

"TORONTO, May 23, 1865.

"I, Godfrey J. Hyams, never stated to any person that Dr. Stuart Robinson knew anything of the expedition connected with Dr. Luke P. Blackburn and myself, respecting infecting the clothes with yellow fever or small-pox: that when I applied to him for money to go away, he said he would not loan or give any money to commit an overt act against the United States: that he never done anything against the Government or never would help him to do so. (This, though not said to Hyams, was, no doubt, heard by him from scores of others, as having been said by me to them, for my careful avoidance of all hostile acts was notorious to everybody.) He (Dr. Robinson) further stated he did not know what I was going to do, and did (not) want to know. I then said I did not intend to tell him. I solemnly believe he did not know anything about it.

"(Signed) GODFREY J. HYAMS."

Indorsed by the American Consul as follows:

"TORONTO, May 30, 1865.

"The within statement was handed to me by Godfrey J. Hyams, to be transmitted to Dr. Robinson.

"(Signed) D. THURSTON."

And yet remember, after all this, the wretch was shipped off from Toronto, where he was about to be indicted for half a dozen perjuries, to figure as a great witness before the Bureau of Military Justice.

His perjuries there seem to have made little impression. His employers seem to have lost confidence in this Harris, alias Hyams, after his recantation as to me. They seemed to consider that Judas' sin consisted chiefly in not sticking to the lie once told, and his folly in throwing away his 30 pieces of silver.

I must refer you for the singular details of this loathsome perjury to my letter to Emmons, of June 19, 1865. This letter had a circulation of probably 200,000, and immediately upon its appearance, for some cause or other, very suddenly the whole matter of the suppressed testimony was hushed up. The intelligent portion of the

secular press seemed ashamed of the horrible hoax, and the Bureau of Military Justice itself seems to long to have it forgotten far more than do some of the parties affected by it.

And yet the ecclesiastical journals seemed loth to give up so hopeful a chance to destroy the man of the True Presbyterian and the Free Christian Commonwealth. Though compelled to take back the defamation which they had circulated, by the outraged common sense of the Christian public it was generally with a manifest disappointment that it had not proved true, and in some cases with the most malignant sort of hissing in the recantation.

It is surely a surprising state of things that, after a falsehood so gross and preposterous has been so thoroughly crushed, and after the aiders and abettors of it have been so thoroughly put to shame, and after the intelligence of the secular world has come to loathe the whole thing of this suppressed testimony as an ineffaceable stigma upon the reputation of our country—sanctimonious malevolence if it dare not say it—yet loses no opportunity of insinuating it in a whisper, as a justifiable method of ecclesiastical warfare! Having taken pains to send every Presbyter an minister a copy of the letter to Emmons, exposing this villainy, I feel justified in holding any such responsible as a willful falsifier before the public for again repeating it; yet I cannot forget that there are others who may neither have seen the exposure nor suspect the motive which leads to the whispered reinsinuation, nor consider how the heats of ecclesiastical strife are apt to generate swarms of *scarabæi* to buzz and trundle in the filth of defamation. But what right have men to plead ignorance for an infamous lie which they propagate without knowing anything about it?

Such is the sort of warfare carried on in this case against me, as a witness for the truth in Jesus. It is a terrible proof of the fallen condition of our church. If this statement seem long to you, it has the advantage of incidentally developing the great doctrine at issue, for asserting which this effort is made to destroy the testimony by assailing the character of the witness.

Let me now briefly state the nature of the question involved in the ecclesiastical strifes which have so arrested your attention as to lead to this meeting. One of the grand peculiarities of the Gospel system, as we understand it—that which distinguishes it from heathen systems—is the idea it suggests of two governments in the world, each complete in itself. One, the civil government ordained by God as author of nature under those ethical laws which reason and the light of nature teach; the other, the spiritual government, ordained by God as the Mediator under those positive laws revealed in His Word. We hold that these two are not to be confounded; that the Church can no more propagate a political faith by what we call the power of the keys, than the civil government propagate religion by the power of the sword. In its last analysis, to affirm the competency of the Church to meddle with civil affairs is heathenism. For, after all, the rhetoric against the aspiring priests of the dark ages for first originating spiritual despotism through union of Church and State, the fact is, that this union began long before even the era of Christ and his Apostles. Religion and the priests of religion were the right arm of every pagan government. The Pontifex Maximus, at Rome, in pagan times, and the College of Priests, were, in fact, the ultimate power of the State, since no election could be had against their veto. The system of Jesus Christ involved a kingdom, but "not of this world," apart from Cæsar's kingdom. And in no point is the religion of Jesus more clearly distinguished from all human religions than in this its peculiar idea of a government spiritual, complete and distinct, from the civil governments which the Author of Nature has ordained for society.

The connection of Church and State originated first in the conversion of a Roman Emperor, Constantine, who, by his pagan political education and creed was unable to conceive that the empire could be ruled without a religion and priests, and at the same time was unable to indorse, by using any longer pagan priests, and therefore substituted the Christian ministry for the pagan priesthood.

It was the Justinian code, based upon this original heathen conception, which kept up the connection, which code continued to rule all Europe for one thousand years. It was the power of that code, and the influence of the jurists, not of the priests, that kept the Church in alliance with the State, and raised that issue—Which shall be supreme, the spiritual or temporal? Now, there is really no such issue according to the Gospel. The spheres of the two are distinct—each supreme in its own sphere. You will find that the jurists who have so eloquently assailed the arrogant claims of the Church to supremacy over the State yet turn round and teach the equally absurd dogma that the State is supreme and the Church subject. This is the Gallican doctrine and the Anglican doctrine—the doctrine of all European State Church systems. Nor are the Republican jurists less inclined to the same blunder of confounding the spheres civil and spiritual. Vattel's chapter on "piety and religion" is as outrageous as ever priest or jurist of the dark ages aught. And even Story and Webster, under the influence of the New England error in "confounding what God hath sundered," will be found to utter dogmas of the States' relation to religion which are, at bottom, but Gospel-washed heathenism.

It was this theory that Brownson assailed so vigorously; and, insofar as he assails that theory and the current New England theory of the Church and State, Brownson has, no doubt, the best of the argument. But neither is the spiritual supreme over the temporal nor the temporal over the spiritual. For Jesus Christ, as Creator, hath ordained the State supreme in temporals, and

as Mediator, the Church supreme in spirituals—each in its sphere.

This was the doctrine of the Scottish Reformers. They, however, were obliged to hold their theory in abeyance under the jealousy of civil tyrants. But in the American system of civil polity, for the first time, the civil government acknowledged the independence of the spiritual power. The great bill enunciating this principle was that which Jefferson thought his immortal act; and he desired it to be inscribed upon his tombstone—that he was the "author of the act establishing religious freedom." This great act, among other things, declares:

"That, whereas, Almighty God hath created the mind free:—that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishment or burthens, or by civil incorporations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as was in His almighty power to do;—that the impious presumptions of legislators and rulers, civil and ecclesiastical, who being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, both established and maintained false religions over the greater part of the world and through all time.

"That to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles, on supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he, being of course judge of that tendency, will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiment of others only as they shall square with, or differ from, his own; *that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government, for officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts* against peace and good order: and, finally, that truth is great and will prevail, if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless, by human interposition, disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate—error ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict it.

2. Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities

3 And though we well know that the Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act to be irrevocable, would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare *that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind*, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right."

Such is the true American theory. I now present, in contrast and by way of specimen of the New England theory, the following provision of the Constitution of Massachusetts of 1789:

"3. As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality, and these cannot be generally diffused throughout the community but by the institution of a public worship of God, and of public institutions of piety, religion and morality, therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of the Government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their Legislature with power to require the several townships, &c., to make suitable provision at their own expense for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety and religion, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily, and to enjoin upon all the subjects an attendance upon their instructions."

Now, it is these two theories of Virginia and of Massachusetts that have been always in antagonism in our Protestant Churches. The Massachusetts theory reasons that, religion being necessary to morality and morality to liberty, therefore the State should propagate religion. The Virginia theory reasons from the same premise to precisely the opposite conclusion, viz—Religion is necessary to morality and morality to liberty; therefore the State should *keep its sooty fingers off religion*, and the Church not defile her garments with the State; that religion may be kept pure, and thereby morality pure—and thus liberty be preserved. For the false morality which is founded upon an impure religion and does wickedness from conscientiousness is the worst immorality and most dangerous to liberty.

And these great truths of Christ, the sole King and law-giver, to the Church and its non-political character, are just as essential to Christian liberty in the Church The great difficulty is, that men will insist on regarding both our theological views of the doctrine of Christ's headship, and our views of the great fundamental principles of ecclesiastical polity, as mere abstractions of little practical value They do not see how the specific constitutional rules have their root in these great principles. Hence they have been so slow to perceive how the false doctrines of the deliverence of 1861 must, of necessity, lead to the Hydra-headed autocracy of the Assembly of 1865. The very tone of the debates—the nice, hair-splitting arguments about our

uniform consequence has followed in the loss of Christian constitutional liberty, and the erection of a hydra-headed autocracy in the very church most conspicuous hitherto for its testimony in behalf of a free Christian commonwealth.

But, men and brethren, the constitution which Christ gave his Church is higher than the "majority of four to one." The General Assembly is not the Church, nor even essential in the Presbyterian system of the Church. It is a mere creature of the Presbyteries, brought into existence by them from year to year, by commissioners whom they send to act and then to return and report to them their doings. Nor does the fact that an unscrupulous faction of newspaper editors, and doctors who can get no more churches or schools of the prophets to kill, place-hunting priests and the ecclesiastical loafers in general, has successfully conspired to seize upon the Church's power and agencies, in the least degree impair the rights of his people under Christ's law, or the noble Constitution which our fathers set up as the expression of Christ's law.

Think not, men and brethren, that I stand here to complain of my Church and her government; or that I take this appeal to the public against my Church. God forbid, that I should go out to the world to expose and vilify the mother that bore me because in an evil hour she hath brought a coarse and cruel step-father into our house to worry us out of it and seize upon our rich inheritance. Permit me rather, in conclusion, with all the zeal of filial affection to offer a word of apology and extenuation to three classes of outsiders who take occasion to scoff at the Church and religion because of these things.

First, that class who cry out—"Behold, what a specimen of Christian charity, equity and magnanimity." I often answer those who plead as the excuse for not coming to Christ themselves, that Christians live so unworthily, with the question—"Do they not, after all, do pretty well, considering the world they live in, and the *company they have to keep*—even such as you perpetually infusing into their minds and heads your spirit of unbelief, carelessness and worldliness?" So here I answer to those who scoff at the caricatures of all law and justice by those ecclesiastical rulers—Do they act so badly after all, considering the company they have had to keep for five years past—such lawyers as you in place of the old lawyers whom the people trusted as the "watchdogs of popular rights;" such judges as have given such decisions as must make the very bones of the Hales and Mansfields and Marshalls rattle in their coffins—such military courts and commissions—"Bureaus of Military Justice," with Presidents, Judge Advocates and Attorneys for the Commonwealth. Remember these ecclesiastics are "men of like passions," and with little opportunity to garner up ideas of law and equity except as they absorb it from the lawyers and judges of the community around them! Therefore, when I blush in shame for my profession, I take comfort in the thought that my clerical brethren have not behaved much worse than the lawyers and judges!

Second, As to the politicians, particularly my good friends, the Democratic politicians, who have cried out, with justice, I admit, against political preachers and church courts as the worst enemies of true liberty and the most facile tools of usurping tyrants. True, but in this matter of the authority and independence of the Church and state, respectively, there are two sides to the question, the ecclesiastical and the political side. There are two spheres in which the truth is to be expounded and defended—one in the State as well as one in the Church. There are two systems of ideas to be preserved and guarded from corruption. The ecclesiastical system of our Scotch fathers and the political system of our American fathers. The great ecclesiastical idea of which Andrew Melville was an apostle—and the great political idea of which Thomas Jefferson was an apostle. Now if the disciples of Melville have proved faithless in the Church, during ten years past, in allowing the intrusions of the political clergy in the Church, have not the disciples of Thomas Jefferson proved equally faithless in submitting, with feeble protest, to like intrusions of clerical politicians in the State? You say why did you not put a stop to this political preaching in the Church? I answer, why did not you, who claim to be the special depositories of Jefferson's principles, put a stop to preaching politics in the name of Christ to the people. If, in 1854, instead of letting the matter pass with the single, but strong and noble protest of Douglas, against the sanctimonious arrogance of the Chicago clergy, and the three thousand memorial clergymen of New England, you had put into your platform with Jefferson's State Rights resolutions of '98, Jefferson's still greater religious freedom resolution of 1788, and sent forth your orators and papers into every neighborhood to teach it to the people, they would very soon have stopped the rations of these Sunday political declaimers, and thereby very quickly have stopped their blatant mouths! If anybody has a right to throw stones at the political church as inconsistent and faithless to principle, it is surely not my good friends of the Democratic party. If it is good logic to argue the church has proved faithless to principle, and therefore her principle is a humbug, it is equally good logic that the Democratic party has proved faithless to Jefferson's principles, and therefore their principles are a humbug!

One word in conclusion to that class generally who persuade themselves, in view of this general apostasy of the Protestant Churches from the great principles of spiritual liberty, that therefore the Church is a failure and religion a failure. Reasoning on the popular error so common both in the Church and out of it, that the Church, if a Divine organization, can do no wrong, instead of reasoning from the Prophets, Apostles and Christ himself, who have expressly forewarned us that through

all dispensations the Church shall be liable to all manner of corruption and wickedness, there might be some force in the argument. But in reality the Gospel Church herein manifests rather its truly Divine character. This is the only organization, and this the only system of religious thought in all the history of the world, that can thus decline to the very verge of apostasy, and yet rebound from final extinction. No human religion, or even human system of philosophy, ever revives once it is smitten with decay. But the history of the Gospel Church of God is a history of perpetual alternation between declension and revival from first to last. It has an hundred times been apparently at the point of extinction, and yet "the gates of hell have not prevailed against it." We whose faith is founded on the immutable word of God, and not on the outward signs of the times merely, have been taught to go calmly forward, witnessing for the truth, and confidently resting upon the promise and the law of administration of our glorious King, even in the darkest hours of faithless apostacy. Standing with the old prophet-watchman in vision amid the darkness and desolation of a wasted Jerusalem, and hearing the hoarse voice of the mocker and the scoffer, who "calleth unto us from Seir," and who, with the cruel satisfaction of hereditary hate, taunts us with the failure of all the covenants and promises from the Church's adorable Head, saying, "Watchman, what of the night?" "Where now the covenant with Abraham and the kingdom that was to be an everlasting kingdom?"

We have learned to answer back with the prophet—"The morning cometh"—ye minions of hell—"The morning cometh." Just as surely as the God of Nature shall cause the sun to keep his appointment in the morning, just so sure shall the God of Grace restore the light to his Church in his appointed time. "The sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in his wings," chase away our darkness; and heal our spiritual diseases.

In this confidence, men and brethren, we stand forth before you to-night—sad, not for ourselves, but for the desolations which Jacobinism is making in the Church of God—yet cheerfully waiting for the consolation of Israel. And having thanked you for this wonderful gathering when I began, let me now thank you again for the kind patience with which you have listened to me to this late hour of night.

LOUISVILLE COURIER STEAM JOB PRINTING DEPARTMENT.